

Amdt. dated August 18, 2004
Reply to Office action of April 18, 2004

Serial No. 09/579,864
Docket No. STL920000034US1
Firm No. 0054.0029

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants added claims 9-14 depending from method claim 1 which substantially include the requirements of claims 3-8.

Applicants added claims 15-21 comprising system claims substantially including the requirements of claims 2-8.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Stedman (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,837) and Imai (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,334).

Claim 1 concerns providing information describing a file system connection between a local file system located on a local system and a host file system located on a host system, said method comprising: encoding the information in a metalanguage format comprising one or more tags, each tag having an identifier and a set of one or more attributes, wherein the encoded information comprises a file system connection descriptor; said file system connection descriptor comprising: a local system data structure representing the local file system; a host system data structure representing the host file system; and a mapping data structure representing a mapping between the local file system and the host file system; and parsing the file system connection descriptor according to the metalanguage tags.

The Examiner cited col. 19, lines 53-67 and col. 20, lines 1-25 of Stedman as teaching the claim requirement of encoding the information in a metalanguage format comprising one or more tags, each tag having an identifier and a set of one or more attributes. (Office Action, pg. 2) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 19 mentions that a host extension creates an HTML document and inserts URLs within the document and tags that identify where the session ID is placed. Stedman defines the host extension as receiving information from a host computer and creating a set of instructions that is transferred via the server application framework to the client computer. The client computer utilizes these instructions to create Web pages. (Stedman, col. 2, lines 47-55) The cited col. 19 further mentions that the server application framework replaces session ID tags with the appropriate session ID.

The cited col. 19 discusses how a host extension creates an HTML document with tags for the session ID to send to the client system. Nowhere does this cited col. 19 of Stedman anywhere teach or suggest that the host extension encode information on a file system connection

Amdt. dated August 18, 2004
Reply to Office action of April 18, 2004

Serial No. 09/579,864
Docket No. STL920000034US1
Firm No. 0054.0029

descriptor. Instead, the cited host extension encodes information for a session ID between a web server and client, not for a file system connection between a local file system and a host file system as claimed.

The cited col. 20 mentions that the host extension inserts a tag that is a placeholder for a identifier and the server replaces this tag with a unique identifier. The server application framework further passes the HTML document to the web server, which sends the document to the originating web browser on the client. The web server keeps track of multiple web browser applications to return HTML documents. There may be multiple host extension processes on the server to handle the connection with different client web browsers having a valid session ID. (Col. 20, lines 1-25).

Although the cited col. 20 of Stedman discusses how host extension processes create tags in HTML documents for a connection with client web browsers, nowhere does the cited col. 20 anywhere teach or suggest that the host extension encode information one a file system connection descriptor as claimed. Instead, the cited host extension encodes information for an HTML page and session ID between a web server and client, not for a file system connection between a local file system and a host file system as claimed. Applicants submit connections between file systems as claimed is different than connections between a web browser and server as discussed in Stedman.

The Examiner cited col. 7, lines 3-20, col. 24, lines 8-44 of Imai and col. 2, lines 55-63 of Stedman as teaching the details concerning the file system connection descriptor. Applicants submit that these cited sections of Imai and Stedman do not teach or suggest a file system connection descriptor including: a local system data structure representing the local file system; a host system data structure representing the host file system; and a mapping data structure representing a mapping between the local file system and the host file system. (Office Action, pgs. 2-3)

The cited col. 7 of Imai mentions that a file requesting client includes a connection unit for setting up a connection with a file server and a file requesting unit to request the file. A file receiving unit receives the file and file storage unit stores the file. Nowhere does this cited col. 7 anywhere teach or suggest a file system connection descriptor including data structures for a local and host file systems and a mapping data structure representing a mapping between the host and

Amdt. dated August 18, 2004
Reply to Office action of April 18, 2004

Serial No. 09/579,864
Docket No. STL920000034US1
Firm No. 0054.0029

local file systems. Instead, the cited col. 7 discusses client units to connect with a server, request a file, receive the requested file, display the file, etc.

The cited col. 24 of Imai mentions that a user program requests the transfer and display of file. A request handling unit handles the display request and the file request unit transmits the request. The file server program transfers the requested file to the requesting client. A multiple file transfer program may be used to transfer multiple files to the client. Although the cited col. 24 discusses operations to request and transfer one or more files, nowhere does the cited col. 24 anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirements of a file system connection descriptor including data structures for a local and host file systems and a mapping data structure representing a mapping between the host and local file systems. Instead, the cited col. 24 concerns a file request and transfer operations to transfer a requested file from a server to client.

The cited col. 2, lines 55-63 of Stedman mentions that the client is linked to the server over the Internet and the server is linked to the host over an SNA network. Nowhere in this cited col. 2 of Stedman is there any teaching or disclosure of the claim requirement of a file system connection descriptor including data structures for a local and host file systems and a mapping data structure representing a mapping between the host and local file systems.

Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited combination because the cited Stedman and Imai, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the requirements of claim 1.

Claim 2 recites a data structure embodied in a computer-readable storage medium, said data structure representing information describing a file system connection between a local file system located on a local system and a host file system located on a host system, wherein said data structure comprises a file system connection descriptor, said file system connection descriptor comprising: a local system data structure representing the local file system; a host system data structure representing the host file system; and a mapping data structure representing a mapping between the local file system and the host file system.

The Examiner cited col. 8, lines 11-23 of Imai as teaching the claim requirement of a host system data structure representing the host file system, in addition to the client system data structure representing the client file system, and a mapping data structure representing a mapping between the local file system and the host file system. (Office action, pg. 4)

Amdt. dated August 18, 2004
Reply to Office action of April 18, 2004

Serial No. 09/579,864
Docket No. STL920000034US1
Firm No. 0054.0029

The cited col. 8 of Imai mentions a request handling unit to handle a file request and that the request processing unit searches a file list for the requested file corresponding to the file request from the file lists and transmits the searched file list to the file requesting client.

Although the cited col. 8 of Imai discusses how a request handling unit searches for a file, nowhere does the cited col. 8 anywhere teach or suggest a local and host system data structures representing a local and host file systems, respectively. Further, nowhere does the cited col. 8 anywhere teach or suggest a mapping data structure representing a mapping between the local file system and the host file system. There is no mention in the cited col. 8 of a mapping between different file systems. Instead, the cited col. 8 discusses how a request for a file is handled.

Applicants submit that claim 2 is patentable over the cited combination of art because the cited Stedman and Imai, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the requirements of claim 2.

Claims 3-8 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claim 2, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. The following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claim 3 depends from claim 2 and further requires that the mapping data structure comprises: a local file extension data structure storing a local file extension; a host file pattern data structure storing a pattern describing a host file to which the local file extension will be applied; and a transfer type data structure storing a transfer type that defines how data will be transferred between the host system and the local system for this mapping.

The Examiner cited col. 22, lines 16-53 of Imai as teaching the claim requirement of a host file pattern data structure storing a pattern describing a host file to which the local file extension will be applied. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 22 mentions that a user requests the transfer and the display of a file by issuing a request and uses the URL to identify the file. A request handling unit in the client handles the display, the file request unit transmits the file request, and the file server program transfers the file to the file requesting client. The client may receive a file list. The list includes files having identifiers requested by the user.

The cited col. 22 of Imai discusses handling of a file request between server and client. Nowhere does the cited col. 22 anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement of a host file

Amdt. dated August 18, 2004
Reply to Office action of April 18, 2004

Serial No. 09/579,864
Docket No. STL920000034US1
Firm No. 0054.0029

pattern data structure storing a pattern describing a host file to which the local file extension will be applied. Instead, the cited col. 22 discusses how a file or list of files matching a request is returned to the client.

The Examiner cited col. 28, lines 38-65 of Imai as teaching the claim requirement of a transfer type data structure storing a transfer type that defines how data will be transferred between the host system and the local system for this mapping. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 28 of Imai discusses a transfer condition for preventing a wasteful transfer of a file of a type which cannot be utilized at the file request client. If a type of the selected file satisfies the transfer condition, the multiple files are transferred. If the type of the selected file does not satisfy the transfer condition, then another file is selected.

Although the cited col. 28 discusses a condition indicating a file type to not transfer, the cited Imai does not teach or suggest the claim requirement of a transfer type data structure storing a transfer type that defines how data will be transferred between the host system and the local system for this mapping. Indicating file types not to transfer as in Imai is different from the claim requirement of a transfer type defining how data will be transferred between a host and local system for a mapping between file systems.

Applicants submit that added claims 9-14 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claim 1, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because they substantially include the requirements of claims 3-8, respectively, which provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art as discussed above.

Claims 15-21 substantially include the requirements of claims 2-8 and are thus patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 2-8.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-21 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit herewith the fee for the added claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

Amdt. dated August 18, 2004
Reply to Office action of April 18, 2004

Serial No. 09/579,864
Docket No. STL920000034US1
Firm No. 0054.0029

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: August 18, 2004

By: 

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984